

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciatively note that claims 2-9 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this Amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations originally recited in claim 2, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-12 remain pending in the application.

The Abstract of the present application is objected to because it does not contain a single paragraph as required by MPEP § 608.01 (b). In response, the Abstract has been amended to meet the requirements as set forth in MPEP § 608.01 (b). Accordingly, the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 are objected to because of the informalities. In response, claim 2 has been cancelled, and claims 4, 6 and 8 have been amended to correct the informalities. Accordingly, the objection to claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as having insufficient antecedent basis. In response, the limitations originally recited in claim 2 have been amended and incorporated into claim 1, and claims 1, 3-10 have been amended to cure the defects of the insufficient antecedent basis. Accordingly, the indefiniteness rejection of claims 1-10 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because claims 1, 10 and 12 appear to direct to both a device and a method. In response, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly recite methods, and claim 12 has been amended to more clearly recite a system. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 12 under 35

U.S.C. 101 should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hummels D. M. (IEEE-Distortion Compensation for time-interleaved ADC). In response, claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 2. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 both includes the same limitations recited in claim 1. Thus, claims 10 and 11 should be allowable for at least the reasons with respect to claim 1.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: March 27, 2008
KMB/SY/ser